

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS**I. Restriction Requirement**

On page 2, items 1-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner requests a restriction to one set of the claims. The argument is that there are two unrelated inventions being claimed. However, the Residential Communications Gateway (RCG) device of claims 1-9 is directly related to a bandwidth allocation method of claims 10-14. These inventions are related. The steps performed by the processor of the RCG device of claims 1-9 is directly related to the method for performing dynamic bandwidth allocation and sharing in claims 10-14.

In particular, claim 1 states, "... a processor capable of creating an ad-hoc wireless network via direct wireless connections between devices, hopping said wireless connections among other RCGs to create a network of wirelessly connected RCGs ...". The processor is performing steps that relate to a method of providing wireless bandwidth allocation capabilities.

In claim 2, it states, "... the processor is capable of ... dynamically allocating its physically connected POTS bandwidth to other RCGs not physically connected to said POTS line(s), requesting said bandwidth, and prioritizing local as well as remote bandwidth requirements on both POTS circuits as well as wireless connections..." These also are steps performed by the processor that relate to the bandwidth allocation.

In claim 3, it states, "... the processor is capable of: allocating separate and physically diverse POTS lines or wireless connections into a multilink group, aggregating the combined bandwidth of a plurality of said separate physically diverse POTS lines or wireless connections, providing said aggregate bandwidth to the benefit of one of a single and a plurality of RCG devices for the concurrent and high speed transmission of one of large and multiple files. ..." These bandwidth allocation steps are being performed by the processor of the RCG device.

In claim 5, it states, "... the processor is capable of providing dynamic bandwidth reallocation for a plurality of separate and physically diverse POTS lines and or wireless connections." This states directly that the processor is performing "dynamic bandwidth reallocation." Similarly, claim 8 states that "... the processor is capable of creating a wireless router table by polling other devices within its transmission range for their wireless routing tables." This again is related to bandwidth allocation.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement.

APPLICATION NO. 10/686,375
PAGE 6 OF 7

II. Provisional Election

The Applicant provisionally elects claim 10-14, drawn to bandwidth allocation.

Respectfully submitted,



H Clay McGurk IV
Reg. No. 34,964

The Law Office of Clay McGurk
P.O. Box 6127
Laguna Niguel, CA 92607

Phone: 949.395.3942
Fax: 949.315.3084

APPLICATION NO. 10/686,375
PAGE 7 OF 7